

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 6, 14, and 22 have been amended. Claims 2, 13, 16, and 18-21 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1 and 3-12, 14, 15, 17, and 22 are pending and under consideration.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112:

In the Office Action, at page 2, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth therein. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested. Independent claim 1 has been amended to improve clarity of the subject matter recited therein. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to the claims be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

In the Office Action, at page 3, claims 1, 3-4, 13-14, and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,903,392 to Kojima ("Kojima"). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

In view of the amendment to independent claims 1 and 22 incorporating claimed features of dependent claim 2, which includes allowable subject matter, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1 and 22 and related dependent claims be allowed. It is respectfully asserted that claims 1 and 3-4, 14, and 22 are in allowable condition.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

In the Office Action, at page 4, claims 5-12, 15, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Kojima and U.S. Patent No. 5,932,342 to Zeira. Further, in the Office Action, at page 4, claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Kojima and U.S. Patent No. 5,473,469 to Magocs. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Because dependent claims 5-12, 15, and 16 depend from independent claim 1, the cited references, individually or combined, must teach or suggest all the claimed features of independent claims 1 and 22. Because the Office Action has recognized that the prior art fails to teach or suggest, "a reflection coating layer on a surface of the retroreflection prism array," as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 22, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to the claims in view of the cited references be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 03/25/2004

By: 
Alicia M. Choi
Registration No. 46,621

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501